

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-17 and 25-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, and 25 have been amended.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-8, 10-17, and 25-29 have been rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0152190 (“Biebesheimer”). Claims 1, 10, and 25 are independent. As described below, the independent claims are not anticipated by Biebesheimer, therefore all of the claims are not anticipated.

The Office Action stated that “nothing in the claim relates the predicted user satisfaction to the evaluation of the user of the search results or that the prediction of the satisfaction is obtained after the user evaluates a set of search results” (Office Action at 8). Each of independent claims 1, 10, and 25 have been amended to address this issue. For example, independent claim 1 now recites “storing interaction of the user with the search results obtained in response to a query;” and “determining at least one predictive pattern for predicting user satisfaction with the search results from the stored interaction of the user with the search results.” Since the claim now recites that the predictive pattern is determined from the user’s interaction with the search results, the claims now relate the “predicted user satisfaction to the evaluation of the user of the search results” and that the “prediction of the satisfaction is obtained after the user evaluates a set of search results.” Independent claims 10 and 25 have similar amendments. Thus, Applicants have addressed the issues raised by the Office Action on page 8.

Further, the Office Action appears to be reading the claims on Beibesheimer because Beibesheimer allegedly determines satisfaction that a user experiences in evaluating search

results by “providing the items that it predicts are most relevant to a user’s query” (Office Action at 8). But independent claim 1, for example, now makes clear that the predictive pattern model is determined from user interaction (e.g., printing, clicking on links, saving data, etc...) or evaluation of the search results, not just with searching and reporting searching. Similarly, independent claim 10 now recites (i) “means for storing satisfaction of a user with search results that is determined by an evaluation of the search results by the user;” (ii) “means for storing interaction of the user with the search results obtained in response to a query;” and (iii) “means for determining at least one predictive pattern model for predicting user satisfaction with the search results based on the satisfaction of the user stored in the means for storing and the user interaction stored in the means for storing user interaction.” Thus, independent claim 10 makes clear that the claimed system determines the “predictive pattern model” from the “evaluation of the search results by the user.” Independent claim 25 contains similar limitations, and therefore is likewise patentable over Beibesheimer. As all of the independent claims are patentable, the dependent ones are as well.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that this after final amendment be entered as it addresses the issues raised in the office action and places the claims in condition for allowance.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2826/306403.01
Application No.: 10/806,271
Office Action Dated: April 30, 2008

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

Date: August 12, 2008

/Michael J. Bonella/
Michael J. Bonella
Registration No. 41,628

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439